PHILIP MORRIS COMPANIES INC. INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

120 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017-5592

TO: R. William Murray DATE: March 19, 1991

FROM: Charles R. Wall CRW

SUBJECT: Jetson Lincoln

I have reviewed the Jet Lincoln material you sent and am left with the questions I originally had. Is this the type of research we want to fund given limited resources and is Jet the person to be supervising it?

I have little doubt that most of the research is of high quality and of importance. Psychological and sociological factors such as hostility and stress have long been suspected as causes of or contributors to chronic diseases. We may even find they cause or exacerbate certain cancers. But does that research address what should be our real concerns?

What, if any, role does cigarette smoking play in lung cancer, emphysema, heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and even Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases? If we had unlimited funds, Jet's research may well be worthy of support. We don't. Therefore we must be more focused. Of all the possible focuses, I believe basic research directed to the mechanisms of the diseases associated with our products is the most appropriate.

The research I am proposing should be under the direction of a scientist who can evaluate it for its scientific merit and make sure that it fits within our overall research objectives once

2026335046

2026335046

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/glhb0003

those are clearly enunciated by senior management. Jet does not fit that role.

Whether we move forward with our bigger research project, senior management, perhaps in consultation with our scientists, needs to decide what kind of research we want to support. What is our objective? With that decision made, one of our scientists should be asked to evaluate the research Jet is funding by answering the following questions:

1. What are our current funding commitments to that research;
2. Does that research fit within our objectives;
3. If no, what are the implications of our funding termination? Will high quality research over many years be wasted? Are there others who will pick it up? How much longer will it need to go on? Should our objectives be changed in light of the answers to the above?
4. If yes, what is the scientific merit of the research? What changes should be made? Even if of high quality, is there better research to be funded elsewhere?

The scientist who evaluates the work may be able to suggest additional questions.

2026335047

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/glhb0003